



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,596	02/27/2002	Dale E. Gulick	2000.051900/TT4033	8995
23720 7590 12/29/2006 WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042			EXAMINER WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/29/2006	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/084,596

Applicant(s)

GULICK, DALE E.

Examiner

Jeffery Williams

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 51-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 51-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to the communication filed on 10/12/2006.

All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

Claims 51 – 65 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 51, 52, 54 – 57, 59 – 62, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flyntz, “Multi-Level Secure Computer With Token-Based Access Control”, U.S. Patent 6,389,542 in view of Angelo, “Method and Apparatus for Allowing Access to Secured computer Resources by Utilizing a Password and an External Encryption Algorithm”, U.S. Patent 5,949,882.**

Regarding claim 51, Flyntz discloses:  
*receiving a request for an authentication, at a microcontroller, requesting security data from a security device; receiving the security data from the security device, at the microcontroller* (Flyntz, col. 2, lines 52-56; col. 15, lines 5-20, 33-36, 53-55).

1 Flyntz discloses that a user requests authentication by supplying security data to the  
2 microcontroller, which in turn processes such security data to evaluate acceptance.

3 *evaluating the security data; and approving the authentication if the security data*  
4 *is evaluated as acceptable* (Flyntz, col. 10, lines 33-40).

5 Flyntz discloses a microcontroller, serving to control the connection of the CPU to  
6 devices located on system buses (Flyntz, fig. 2; col. 5, line 61 – col. 6, line 25; col. 15,  
7 lines 21-32). The system of Flyntz allows for the provision of power to secure system  
8 portions after a positive indication of acceptability has been received (Flyntz, Abstract;  
9 col. 1, lines 55-63). The microcontroller receives a request for authentication via  
10 connection to a security device (Flyntz, fig. 2:31). Flyntz, however, does not disclose  
11 the microcontroller as *included in a bridge*.

12 Like Flyntz, Angelo discloses controlling circuitry to implement a secure power up  
13 procedure for providing power to system portions on system buses, upon permission for  
14 authorized users (Angelo, Abstract; col. 6, lines 44-50; col. 11, lines 17-45). Angelo  
15 specifically discloses that the controlling circuitry used to accomplish this procedure is  
16 included in the bridge, thus allowing the system to control the connection of the CPU to  
17 devices located on system buses (Angelo, fig. 1-130; col. 5, lines 1-30). The inclusion  
18 of the above mentioned security features within the bridge allows for increased  
19 hardware security, as security data may be entered via a secure communication path to  
20 the bridge after a request for authentication has been received (Angelo, 2:39-43; 11:64-  
21 12:9).

1           It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the secure  
2 bridge implementation of Angelo for connecting devices on system buses along with the  
3 security microcontroller of Flyntz for connecting devices on system buses. This would  
4 have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated  
5 by the showing of prior art that the above mentioned security features need not be  
6 constructed as separate system components, but rather, may be feasibly included  
7 within the existing computer system's bridge, thereby allowing the secure connection of  
8 the CPU to devices located on buses (Angelo, fig. 2-130; col. 2, lines 39-43; 5:13-26;  
9 10:33-54), as well as increased hardware security.

10           The combination of Flyntz and Angelo discloses the request being received from  
11 a bus external to the bridge (Flyntz, fig. 2, elem. 31).

12  
13           Regarding claim 52, the combination of Flyntz and Angelo discloses:  
14           *disapproving the authentication if the security data is evaluated as unacceptable*  
15 (Flyntz, col. 2, lines 53-57; col. 10, lines 33-37).

16  
17           Regarding claim 53, the combination of Flyntz and Angelo discloses *wherein*  
18 *evaluating the security data comprises requesting an indication of acceptability inside*  
19 *SMM* (Angelo, Abstract; col. 6, lines 44-50; col. 5: 21-30; col. 11, lines 17-45).

20  
21           Regarding claim 54, the combination of Flyntz and Angelo discloses:

1        *wherein requesting security data from a security device comprises requesting the*  
2        *security data from the security device over a direct connection between the security*  
3        *device and the microcontroller; and wherein receiving the security data from the security*  
4        *device, at the microcontroller, comprises receiving the security data from the security*  
5        *device over the direct connection to the microcontroller (Flyntz, fig. 2, elem. 31, 32).*

6        The combination of Flyntz and Angelo discloses a direct connection between the  
7        security device and the microcontroller.

8  
9        Regarding claim 55, the combination of Flyntz and Angelo discloses:

10       *wherein requesting security data from a security device comprises requesting*  
11       *biometric data from a biometric device; wherein receiving the security data from the*  
12       *security device, at the microcontroller, comprises receiving the biometric data from the*  
13       *biometric device, at the microcontroller (Flyntz, col. 2, lines 52-56; col. 15, lines 5-20,*  
14       *33-36, 53-55; col. 6, lines 36-46).*

15       *wherein evaluating the security data comprises evaluating the biometric data;*  
16       *and wherein approving the authentication if the security data is evaluated as acceptable*  
17       *comprises approving the authentication if the biometric data is evaluated as acceptable*  
18       *(Flyntz, col. 2, lines 52-56; col. 15, lines 5-20, 33-36, 53-55; col. 6, lines 36-46; col. 10,*  
19       *lines 33-40).*

20



In response, the examiner reaffirms that the combination teaches a microcontroller comprised within a bridge, and a request received from a bus external to the bridge (Flyntz, fig. 2:32; claims 8,9,16; Angelo, fig. 1:130; 5:1-30; 10:33-65; see also rejections above). Though the applicant has pointed out a microprocessor (fig. 1:102) that is part of the system of Angelo, the examiner points out that microprocessor (Angelo, fig. 1:102) was never relied upon within the above rejections. Additionally, the microprocessor (102) was never said to have been inside of bridge (130). This microprocessor does not correspond to the microcontroller of the prior art for controlling the secure power up and access of resources to verified users - the microcontroller further comprised within a bridge.

## Conclusion

Claims 51 – 65 are rejected.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

**See Notice of References Cited.**



1                   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of  
2 time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

3           A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE**  
4 **MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within  
5 **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not  
6 mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the  
7 shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any  
8 extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of  
9 the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later  
10 than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11  
12           Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
13 examiner should be directed to Jeffery Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-  
14 7965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

15           If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
16 supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone  
17 number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)  
18 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

1 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the  
2 Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for  
3 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.  
4 Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.  
5 For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should  
6 you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic  
7 Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9  
10 J. Williams

11 AU 2137

*JW*

*cg Moise*  
EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER